```
1
 2
 3
 4
                                                            NO JS-6
5
6
7
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
9
                       CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
   SHEILA RIOS,
                                      Case No. EDCV 11-00891 DDP (OPx)
                   Plaintiff,
12
                                      ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT AURORA
13
                                      LOAN SERVICES'S MOTION TO DISMISS
        v.
   QUALITY LOAN CORP. AURORA
   LOAN SERVICES,
                                     [Motion filed on 6/15/11]
15
                   Defendants.
16
17
18
        Presently before the court is the Motion to Dismiss
   Plaintiff's Complaint filed by Defendant Aurora Loan Services.
19
20
   Because Plaintiff has not filed an opposition, the court GRANTS the
21
   motion.
22
        Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an
   opposing party to file an opposition to any motion at least twenty-
23
2.4
   one (21) days prior to the date designated for hearing the motion.
25
   C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-9. Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that
26
   "[t]he failure to file any required paper, or the failure to file
27
   it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or
28
   denial of the motion." C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-12.
```

Case 5:11-cv-00891-DDP-OP Document 9 Filed 08/22/11 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #:135

The hearing on Defendant's motion was set for July 25, 2011. Plaintiff's opposition was therefore due by July 11, 2011. As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has not filed an opposition, or any other filing that could be construed as a request for a continuance. Accordingly, the court deems Plaintiff's failure to oppose as consent to granting the motion to dismiss, and GRANTS the motion. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 22, 2011 United States District Judge